

CALIFORNIA'S Consolidated State Application September 1, 2003, Submission

**for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)**

**Due: September 1, 2003
Submitted: August 29, 2003**



**U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202**

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for ESEA GOALS AND ESEA INDICATORS

Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- 2.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

Performance goal 3: By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

- 3.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of classes being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).
- 3.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, “professional development,” is defined in section 9101 (34)).
- 3.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d)).

Performance goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

- 4.1 Performance indicator: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.

- 5.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma.
- 5.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who drop out of school.

ESEA GOALS and ESEA INDICATORS

Performance Indicator 2.1: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

For this September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, States must report information related to their standards and assessments for English language proficiency and baseline data and performance targets for ESEA Performance Indicator 2.1.

A. California's English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards and Assessments

Please describe the status of the State's efforts to establish ELP standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students. Specifically, describe how the State's ELP standards:

- **Address grades K through 12**
- **Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing**
- **Are linked to the academic content and achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, and in science (by 2005-2006)**

CALIFORNIA'S RESPONSE

California's English Language Development (ELD) standards were adopted by the State Board of Education in 1999. The *English Language Development Standards for California Public Schools, K-12* can be accessed through CDE's Web site at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/cdepress/Eng-Lang-Dev-Stnd.pdf>. The ELD standards address the skills that LEP students in grades K-12 must acquire in English proficiency to become proficient in the state's English-language arts standards. The ELD standards are linked to the English-language arts standards. At the early proficiency levels, one ELD standard may be linked to several English-language arts standards. At the more advanced levels, the skills in the ELD standards resemble those in the English-language arts standards.

The ELD standards form the framework for the California English Language Development Test (CELDT). The standards encompass four grade spans: kindergarten through second grade, third through fifth grade, sixth through eighth grade, and ninth through twelfth grade. The standards also reflect five proficiency levels: beginning, early intermediate, intermediate, early advanced, and advanced.

The ELD standards address the domains of: listening and speaking, reading, and writing. The listening and speaking standards for English learners identify a student's competency to understand the English language and to produce the language orally. Students must be prepared to use English effectively in social and academic settings.

English learners in kindergarten through grade two demonstrate proficiency in the reading skills of phonemic awareness, decoding, and concepts of print appropriate for their grade levels. These standards are embedded in the ELD standards. English learners in grades three through twelve must demonstrate proficiency in those essential beginning reading skills by the time they reach the early intermediate level of the ELD standards. This expectation holds true for students who enter school regardless of whether they are literate or not in their primary language. The ELD standards in reading address the areas of: word analysis, including phonemic awareness, decoding, and word recognition; fluency and systematic vocabulary development; reading comprehension; and literary response and analysis.

Writing strategies and applications and English-language conventions are addressed in the ELD writing standards in kindergarten through twelfth grade.

California is researching methodologies through the CELDT Program Advisory Group in order to link the English Language Development standards to the California academic content and achievement standards in mathematics and science (by 2005-2006).

B. Baseline Data for Performance Indicator 2.1

In the following table, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) baseline data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration. English language proficiency baseline data should include all students in the State who were identified as limited English proficient by State-selected English language proficiency assessments, regardless of student participation in Title III supported programs.

1. The ELP baseline data should include the following:

- Total number of students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s);
- Total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments; and
- A list of each of the ELP assessment(s) used to determine level of English language proficiency.

2. The baseline data should:

- Indicate all levels of English language proficiency; and
- Be aggregated at the State level.
- If a State is reporting data using an ELP composite score (e.g., a total score that consists of a sum or average of scores in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension), the State must:
 - Describe how the composite score was derived;
 - Describe how all five domains of English language proficiency were incorporated into the composite score; and
 - Describe how the domains were weighted to develop the composite score.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the required information.

(Sample) Baseline Data for 2002-2003					
ELP Assessment(s)	Total number of LEP Identified	Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1	Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2	Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3	Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4
(1)*	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)

*

(1) List all of the State-selected ELP assessment(s) used during the 2002-2003 school year to assess LEP students.

(2) Total number of students identified as LEP according to ELP assessments(s).

(3-6) Number and percentage of students at each level of English language proficiency, as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments. If the State uses labels such as Level 1, Level 2, etc., the level at which students are designated "Proficient" should be indicated. For example, in this sample format, students at Level 4 are considered proficient in English. States should use the same ELP labels as defined in State ELP standards and assessment(s). If the ELP standards and assessment(s) define more than four levels, the table should be expanded to incorporate all levels.

Please provide the following additional information:

1. English language proficiency assessment(s) used, including the grades and domains addressed by each assessment (e.g., IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test (IPT I), grades K-6, listening and speaking).

2. Total number of students **assessed** for English language proficiency on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using State-selected ELP assessments).

3. Total number of students **identified** as LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s)).

B. California's Baseline Data for Performance Indicator 2.1

Baseline Data on the CELDT for 2002-03

EL Assessment	Total number of EL Students*	Number and Percentage at Beginning**	Number and Percentage at Early Intermediate**	Number and Percentage at Intermediate**	Number and Percentage at Early Advanced**	Number and Percentage at Advanced**
CELDT	1,599,542	124,231 (10%)	248,662 (19%)	476,866 (37%)	326,757 (25%)	120,919 (9%)

* The total number of English Learners (EL) is reported based on the 2002-03 Language Census. California law requires that all LEP students (those counted on the Language Census), kindergarten through twelfth grade, be assessed using the CELDT (CA Ed. Code 60810, 60812, and 60813). Initial identification administration is conducted with all K - 12 students who have a home language other than English within 30 calendar days of initial enrollment. After initial identification, LEP students take the CELDT during the annual testing window (July 1 – October 31). It is possible for students who move during the testing window to be assessed twice on the CELDT. For that reason, there can be duplicate entries on the CELDT. The Language Census, which is conducted on a single day, does not contain duplicate counts and, therefore, is the most accurate count. The 2002-03 reporting cycle for the CELDT ended on June 30, 2003. The preliminary number of students who took the CELDT in 2002-03 is **1,786,744**. This number includes students who were identified as Initial-Fluent-English-Proficient (IFEP) as well as LEP students.

** The number and percentage of students at the five CELDT performance levels includes only those students who were previously identified as EL and who took the CELDT during the 2002-03 annual assessment window (July 1, 2002 – October 31, 2002) (N=1,297,435). These figures do not include those who took an initial test in 2002-03. EL students take the initial test if they are new students to the school district without a prior CELDT score; entering kindergarten students take the initial test.

In accordance with the English language development standards, the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) is designed to assess students in four grade spans: K-2, 3-5, 6-8 and 9-12. Five proficiency levels (Beginning, Early Intermediate, Intermediate, Early Advanced, Advanced) were developed for each skill area and for the overall score. A description of the proficiency levels is available on the Internet at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/statetests/celdt/resources/K2back.pdf> for grades K through 2, <http://www.cde.ca.gov/statetests/celdt/resources/35BACK.pdf> for grades 3 through 5, <http://www.cde.ca.gov/statetests/celdt/resources/68BACK.pdf> for grades 6 through 8, and <http://www.cde.ca.gov/statetests/celdt/resources/912BACK.pdf> for grades 9 through 12.

The CELDT provides scores for the skill areas of listening and speaking, reading and writing as well as an overall score. The overall score for grades 2-12 is derived from weighting the skill area scores as follows:

50% listening and speaking, 25% reading, and 25% writing.

Since students in kindergarten and grade 1 are currently assessed only in listening and speaking, there is no weighting and therefore their listening/speaking scale scores are also the overall score.

The CELDT is being modified to comply with all NCLB requirements for tests of English language proficiency. The following table shows the schedule for the modifications.

California's Timeline for CELDT Modifications for Compliance with NCLB

CELDT Modification	Expected Date
Addition of Comprehension Score	2004 (Form D)
Development and Reporting of Separate Sub-scores for the Listening/Speaking Skill Area	2004 (Form D)
Addition of Reading Skill Area for Kindergarten and Grade 1	2003 – Item Development 2004 – Field Test 2005 (Form E) – Completed
Addition of Writing Skill Area for Kindergarten and Grade 1	2003 – Item Development 2004 – Field Test 2005 (Form E) – Completed

CALIFORNIA – Scale Score Cut Points

The following tables represent the cut points for each of the proficiency levels at each grade. These scale score cut points are consistent across all forms of the CELDT.

CELDT Overall Proficiency Levels

Test Level	Beginning	Early Intermediate	Intermediate	Early Advanced	Advanced
Kindergarten	409 and below	410-457	458-505	506-553	554 and more
Grade 1	423 and below	424-470	471-516	517-563	564 and more
Grade 2	442 and below	443-482	483-523	524-564	565 and more
Grades 3-5	446 and below	447-487	488-528	529-568	569 and more
Grades 6-8	446 and below	447-487	488-528	529-568	569 and more
Grades 9-12	446 and below	447-487	488-528	529-568	569 and more

CELDT Listening/Speaking Proficiency Levels

Test Level	Beginning	Early Intermediate	Intermediate	Early Advanced	Advanced
Kindergarten	409 and below	410-457	458-505	506-553	554 and more
Grade 1	423 and below	424-470	471-516	517-563	564 and more
Grade 2	453 and below	454-494	495-535	536-576	577 and more
Grades 3-5	437 and below	438-481	482-525	526-568	569 and more
Grades 6-8	437 and below	438-481	482-525	526-568	569 and more
Grades 9-12	437 and below	438-481	482-525	526-568	569 and more

CELDT Reading Proficiency Levels

Test Level	Beginning	Early Intermediate	Intermediate	Early Advanced	Advanced
Grade 2	437 and below	438-474	475-510	511-547	548 and more
Grades 3-5	465 and below	466-498	499-532	533-565	566 and more
Grades 6-8	465 and below	466-498	499-532	533-565	566 and more
Grades 9-12	465 and below	466-498	499-532	533-565	566 and more

CELDT Writing Proficiency Levels

Test Level	Beginning	Early Intermediate	Intermediate	Early Advanced	Advanced
Grade 2	423 and below	424-468	469-513	514-558	559 and more
Grades 3-5	444 and below	445-487	488-529	530-572	573 and more
Grades 6-8	444 and below	445-487	488-529	530-572	573 and more
Grades 9-12	444 and below	445-487	488-529	530-572	573 and more

C. California's Performance Targets (Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives) for English Language Proficiency

Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency. Please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards. Please include in your response:

- **The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments**
- **A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English.**

CALIFORNIA'S RESPONSE

For the second annual measurable achievement objective (AMAO), the California State Board of Education defined proficient as Early Advanced Overall with all skill areas at the Intermediate level or above. The skill areas in grades 2 through 12 that need to be at least at the Intermediate level are: listening and speaking, reading, and writing. In kindergarten and grade one, the skill areas currently tested include listening and speaking only. Section B contains the timeline for development of the reading and writing subtest in grades 1 and 2 and the cut scores for the CELDT.

See Section B (pages 9 – 10) for tables of the cut scores for the English proficiency levels from the CELDT.

For the 2002 scores, comprehension was included as part of reading and listening/speaking but was not reported as a separate sub-skill. Comprehension will be included as a separate sub-skill beginning with the 2004 administration of the CELDT.

Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children making progress in learning English. Please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments. Please include in your response:

- **A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments**
- **A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources)**
- **A description of the language domains in which students must make progress in moving from one English language proficiency level to the next**

CALIFORNIA'S RESPONSE

California's definition of "making progress" or the annual growth target for the first AMAO is to gain 1 proficiency level on the CELDT annually until students reach the level of English language proficiency (Early Advanced Overall, with no sub-skill below Intermediate). Students at the Early Advanced Overall level, with some skill areas below Intermediate, are expected to bring all the skill areas up to the Intermediate level. For students who have reached the English Proficient level but have not been re-designated as Fluent English Proficient (R-FEP), the annual goal is to maintain the English proficient level.

A description of the proficiency levels is available on the CDE Web site at:

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/statetests/celdt/resources/K2back.pdf> for grades K through 2,
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/statetests/celdt/resources/35BACK.pdf> for grades 3 through 5,
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/statetests/celdt/resources/68BACK.pdf> for grades 6 through 8,
 and <http://www.cde.ca.gov/statetests/celdt/resources/912BACK.pdf> for grades 9 through 12.

See Section B (pages 9 - 10) for tables of the cut scores for the English proficiency levels and the language domains included.

In the table that follows, please provide performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for:

- The percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English
- The percentage or number of LEP students who will attain English language proficiency

Performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives are projections for increases in the percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English and who will attain English language proficiency.

A table has been provided to accommodate States' varying approaches for establishing their performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives. Some States may establish the same performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for all grade levels in the State. Other States may establish separate performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for elementary, middle, and high school, for example. If a State establishes different performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for different grade levels/grade spans/cohorts, the State should complete a separate table for each grade level/grade span/cohort and indicate next to the "unit of analysis/cohort" the grade level/grade span/cohort to which the performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives apply.

Please provide the State's definition of cohort(s). Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

CALIFORNIA'S RESPONSE

The cohort for AMAO 1 is all English learners, K-12, who have two years of CELDT data.

The cohort for AMAO 2 is:

- English Learners who have been in U.S. schools for 4 or more years who have two years of CELDT data
- English learners at the Intermediate level or above who did not reach English proficiency the prior year
- Students below the Intermediate level the prior year who met the English proficient level the second year

See **Attachment A** for a more complete description of the two AMAOs.

**California's English Language Proficiency Performance Targets/
Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives**

English Language Proficiency Targets	Percent of LEP Students in each LEA Meeting Annual Growth Objective ^a (AMAO 1)	Percent of LEP Students in each LEA Attaining English Language Proficiency ^b (AMAO 2)
2003-2004 School Year	51.0	30.0
2004-2005 School Year	51.5	30.7
2005-2006 School Year	52.0	31.4
2006-2007 School Year	52.5	32.1
2007-2008 School Year	54.1	34.1
2008-2009 School Year	55.8	36.1
2009-2010 School Year	57.4	38.1
2010-2011 School Year	59.0	40.1
2011-2012 School Year	60.6	42.1
2012-2013 School Year	62.2	44.1
2013-2014 School Year	64.0	46.0

The cohort for AMAO 1 is all English learners, K-12, who have two years of CELDT data.

The cohort for AMAO 2 is:

- English Learners who have been in U.S. schools for 4 or more years who have two years of CELDT data
- English learners at the Intermediate level or above who did not reach English proficiency the prior year
- Students below the Intermediate level the prior year who met the English proficient level

See **Attachment A** for a more complete description of how California is meeting the Title III accountability requirements under No Child Left Behind (NCLB).

^a The annual growth objective is to gain 1 proficiency level on the CELDT annually until students reach the level of English Language Proficiency (Early Advanced Overall, with no subskill below Intermediate). Students at the Early Advanced Level Overall, with some skill areas below Intermediate are expected to bring all the skill areas up to the Intermediate level. For students who have reached the English Proficient level but have not been redesignated as R-FEP, the annual goal is to maintain this level.

^b English language proficiency was defined as Early Advanced Overall on the CELDT with no subskills below Intermediate.

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.1: The percentage of classes being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).

NCLB places a major emphasis upon teacher quality as a factor in improving student achievement. The new Title II programs focus on preparing, training, and recruiting high-quality teachers and principals and requires States to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

The requirement that teachers be highly qualified, as defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA, applies to public elementary and secondary school teachers teaching in core academic subjects. (The term “core academic subjects” means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography (*Section 9101(11)*)). For more detailed information on highly qualified teachers, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIIguidance2002.doc>

A. In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of classes in the core academic subjects being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines “high-poverty” schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by “highly qualified” teachers both in the aggregate for the State and for high-poverty schools in the State in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects that will be taught by highly qualified teachers by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

California's Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers: State Aggregate	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers: High-Poverty Schools
2002-2003 Baseline	48%	35%
2003-2004 Target	65%	57%
2004-2005 Target	83%	79%
2005-2006 Target	100%	100%

B. To best understand the data provided by States, please provide the State's definition of a highly qualified teacher below.

The California State Board of Education (SBE), at its July 2003 meeting, released proposed regulations (CCR Title V...) that delineate the criteria for being certified as NCLB compliant (highly qualified) in California's public schools. (See text of California's Conceptual Plan in **Attachment B.**)

The data used to generate the baseline count and Annual Targets was collected through the annual California Basic Education Data System (CBEDS). In particular, data from the Professional Assignment Information Form (PAIF) was used to determine the percent of credentialed teachers in core academic subject classes in California.

That number was reduced to reflect the likelihood (based on the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing data):

- that elementary teachers had passed a rigorous state assessment to gain their credentials (about 60%), and
- that about 25% of secondary core academic subject class teachers had earned their supplemental authorizations by completing a major or major equivalent of credits.

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.2: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, “professional development,” is defined in section 9101 (34)).

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. The term “high-quality professional development” means professional development that meets the criteria outlined in the definition of professional development in Title IX, Section 9101(34) of ESEA. For more detailed information on high-quality professional development, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIguidance2002.doc>

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of teachers who received “high-quality professional development” in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of teachers who will receive “high-quality professional development” through the 2005-2006 school year. The data for this element should include all public elementary and secondary school teachers in the State.

California's Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Teachers Receiving High-Quality Professional Development*
2002-2003 Baseline	25%
2003-2004 Target	50%
2004-2005 Target	75%
2005-2006 Target	100%

* These numbers reflect the State's best estimates at this time. More specific data will be collected for the first time in October 2003.

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.3: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d).)

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SASA/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who were qualified, as defined above, in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who will be qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

California's Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2002-2003 Baseline	20%
2003-2004 Target	47%
2004-2005 Target	74%
2005-2006 Target	100%

Baseline data and performance targets for Goal 4, Performance Indicator 4.1:

The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSDFS/unsafeschoolchoice.doc>.

For baseline data, please provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous by the start of the 2003-2004 school year. For performance targets, please provide the number of schools that will be identified as persistently dangerous through the 2013-2014 school year.

California's Baseline Data and Targets	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2003-2004 Baseline	0
2004-2005 Target	0
2005-2006 Target	0
2006-2007 Target	0
2007-2008 Target	0
2008-2009 Target	0
2009-2010 Target	0
2010-2011 Target	0
2011-2012 Target	0
2012-2013 Target	0
2013-2014 Target	0

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.1:

The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

In the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, indicator 5.1 read: “The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma – disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged—calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.” However, section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State’s academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

The Secretary approved each State’s definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State’s accountability plan. To reduce burden, provide flexibility, and promote more consistent data collection by the Department, we ask that the information you submit in this September 1, 2003, consolidated State application reflect this Title I definition rather than the definition used in the NCES Common Core of Data.

Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State’s accountability plan, in the following charts please provide baseline data and performance targets for the graduation rate. For baseline data, please provide the graduation rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For performance targets, please indicate what the State graduation rate will be through the 2013-2014 school year.

California's Baseline Data: GRADUATION RATE

High School Graduates	High School Graduation Rate
Student Group	2001-02 Baseline
All Students	86.9
African American/Black	77.1
American Indian/Native Alaskan	83.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	93.3
Hispanic	81.0
White	92.2
Other	80.8
Students with Disabilities	N/A*
Students without Disabilities	N/A*
Limited English Proficient	N/A*
Economically Disadvantaged	N/A*
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	N/A*
Migrant	N/A*
Male	85.2
Female	88.6

* Data for the 2002-03 school year for these sub-groups will be collected for the first time in October 2003. Four years of data are required to calculate the NCES Graduation Rate. Therefore, rates for these sub-groups will be available for the first time after the October 2006 data collection. (For more information about the State's calculation of the graduation rate, please refer to Critical Element 7.1 of California's Accountability Workbook:

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/pr/nclb/workbook/wb6601.pdf>)

CALIFORNIA'S PERFORMANCE TARGETS: GRADUATION RATE

High School Graduates	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
Student Group												
All Students	87.0	87.1	87.2	87.3	87.4	87.5	87.6	87.7	87.8	87.9	88.0	88.1
African American/Black	77.2	77.3	77.4	77.5	77.6	77.7	77.8	77.9	78.0	78.1	78.2	78.3
American Indian/Native Alaskan	83.5	83.6	83.7	83.8	83.9	84.0	84.1	84.2	84.3	84.4	84.5	84.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	93.4	93.5	93.6	93.7	93.8	93.9	94.0	94.1	94.2	94.3	94.4	94.5
Hispanic	81.1	81.2	81.3	81.4	81.5	81.6	81.7	81.8	81.9	82.0	82.1	82.2
White	92.3	92.4	92.5	92.6	92.7	92.8	92.9	93.0	93.1	93.2	93.3	93.4
Other	80.9	81.0	81.1	81.2	81.3	81.4	81.5	81.6	81.7	81.8	81.9	82.2
Students with Disabilities	N/A*											
Students without Disabilities	N/A*											
Limited English Proficient	N/A*											
Economically Disadvantaged	N/A*											
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	N/A*											
Migrant	N/A*											
Male	85.3	85.4	85.5	85.6	85.7	85.8	85.9	86.0	86.1	86.2	86.3	86.4
Female	88.7	88.8	88.9	89.0	89.1	89.2	89.3	89.4	89.5	89.6	89.7	89.8

* Data for the 2002-03 school year for these sub-groups will be collected for the first time in October 2003. Four years of data are required to calculate the NCES Graduation Rate. Therefore, rates for these sub-groups will be available for the first time after the October 2006 data collection. (For more information about the State's calculation of the graduation rate, please refer to Critical Element 7.1 of California's Accountability Workbook:

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/pr/nclb/workbook/wb6601.pdf>)

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.2: The percentage of students who drop out of school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data.

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

In the following charts, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged. For baseline data, in the following charts please indicate the State high school dropout rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For targets, please indicate the State high school dropout rate through the 2013-2014 school year.

CALIFORNIA'S BASELINE DATA: DROPOUT RATE

Student Dropouts	Student Dropout Rate
Student Group	2001-02 Baseline
All Students	2.7
African American/Black	4.9
American Indian/Native Alaskan	3.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.4
Hispanic	3.7
White	1.7
Other	5.3
Students with Disabilities	N/A*
Students without Disabilities	N/A*
Limited English Proficient	N/A*
Economically Disadvantaged	N/A*
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	N/A*
Migrant	N/A*
Male	3.0
Female	2.5

*Data for these subgroups will be collected for the first time in October 2003.

CALIFORNIA'S PERFORMANCE TARGETS: DROPOUT RATE

Student Dropouts	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
Student Group												
All Students	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5
African American/Black	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.7
American Indian/Native Alaskan	3.5	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.2
Hispanic	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.5
White	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.5
Other	5.2	5.1	5.0	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.1
Students with Disabilities	N/A*											
Students without Disabilities	N/A*											
Limited English Proficient	N/A*											
Economically Disadvantaged	N/A*											
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	N/A*											
Migrant	N/A*											
Male	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8
Female	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.3

*Data for these subgroups will be collected for the first time in October 2003.